DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 204 772 CS 206 421

AUTHOR Marmarelli, Ron
TITLE The "Crane Problem" in Journalism Historiography.
PUB DATE Aug 81
NOTE 22p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (64th, East Lansing, MI, August 8-11, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Authors: *Biographies: *Historiography: History: *Journalism: *Reliability: *Research Problems: Research Skills: *Scholarship
IDENTIFIERS *Crane (Stephen): News Reporters

ABSTRACT

Attempting to correct and amplify the portrayal of Stephen Crane in journalism history, this paper provides an analysis of relevant works in journalism and other disciplines in order to point out the weaknesses in the journalism historiography and to show how they apparently came about. Evidence is presented from the literature of journalism, showing that the prevailing image of Crane is that of a hotshot literary celebrity who failed as a war correspondent. Other evidence is provided to suggest that Crane was far from a failure, actually one of the best of the group of correspondents reporting the Spanish-American War. The study closes with a call for improved journalism scholarship by means of consistent verification of information, careful assessment of the reliability of sources, proper use of evidence, and greater awareness of relevant scholarship in other fields. It also suggests that journalism scholars must make a greater effort at questioning their assumptions, stereotypes, and predispositions, especially when considering unconventional journalistic figures and phenomena, such as the literary journalist. (Author/RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED204772

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

THE "CRANE PROBLEM" IN JOURNALISM HISTORIOGRAPHY

BY

Ron Marmarelli
Department of Journalism
Central Michigan University
Mt. Pleasant, MI 48859

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ron Marmarelli
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presented to the History Division, Association for Education in Journalism, annual convention, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, August 1981.

CS206427

THE "CRANE PROBLEM" IN JOURNALISM HISTORIOGRAPHY

Literary scholars frequently express dismay at their difficulty in defining the work and life of Stephen Crane. The characteristics of his writings, the brevity of his life, and his willingness to "go through life unexplained"[1] have led to widely divergent assessments of his work and troubling uncertainties about his life. "After all," he wrote a friend in 1896, "I cannot help vanishing and disappearing and dissolving. It is my foremost trait."[2] His earliest biographers agreed,[3] and in 1926 a former editor wrote of "the fog of fiction" that surrounded Crane.[4] One scholar notes that Crane "has been a handy peg upon which to hang pet theories and myths." The phenomenon has come to be known as the "Crane Problem."[5]

Journalism historians have their own sort of "Crane Problem." Stephen Crane drifts almost unnoticed through the history of American journalism. When he is noticed, it is sometimes in a deprecatory manner, as when he is said to be "beneath notice..., except as one of the endless entourage of name writers who are used as circulation lures."[6] Other notice is neutral and brief, listing him, for example, among literary figures whose careers began in journalism and whose literary work shows the influence of journalistic experience or including him among the company of correspondents who went to Cuba to cover the Spanish-American War.[7]

Too frequently, as this paper attempts to show, Crane is dealt with carelessly or erroneously by writers whose research appears to have been remarkably haphazard and limited. In a 1960 AEJ History Division paper, for example, Crane is mentioned briefly and curtly dismissed, on the basis of limited and selectively used evidence, as one of the "literary stars" hired to report the war, who, as their editors had expected, had no news sense. In addition, Crane, it is stated, had other problems.

> Although he was charming and friendly to reporters, Crane was lazy and too devoted to the bottle to get any real reporting done. Sylvester Scovel, who gave Crane his assignments on the field, had a difficult time of it getting the novelist's copy.[8]

The flaws in that paper, especially as they pertain to Crane, illustrate the nature of the "Crane Problem" in journalism historiography. Much of the flawed scholarship regarding Crane, some of which is found in works of the most successful and prolific writers in the field, has resulted from similarly limited and selectively used evidence and from dependence on unreliable sources that have been used uncritically. Ignorance of scholarship in other fields, such as literary history and biography, has also contributed to the problem.

Promoting Crane as a pre-eminent figure in American journalism is not the purpose of this paper. He is and will remain a secondary figure. His journalistic work was limited. His contributions to the development of American journalism may justly be termed non-existent. Even as a secondary figure, however, his treatment in the literature of journalism ought to be accurate and fair and be based on careful research, if only to maintain the integrity of scholarship in the field.

The purpose here is to correct and amplify the picture of Crane that appears in many works in journalism history, which will be examined, and to make a point about the need for journalism scholars to extend themselves and to become aware of scholarship in other fields. Since Crane appears most frequently in journalism historiography in his role as a correspondent in the Spanish-American War, and since it is in the accounts of his performance in that role that the deficiencies are most evident, this paper will focus on that element of the "Crane Problem."[9]

* * * * * * * * * *

From 1888, when he was 16, until his death at 28 in 1900, Crane had a variety of associations with newspapers, usually as a free-lance contributor or as a

"special correspondent."[10] His service as a war correspondent was brief, though he covered two wars.[11] Given that his life was short, it seems ironically fitting that his two wars were brief affairs. The Greco-Turkish War of 1897, which Crane covered for Hearst's New York Journal and for the English Westminster Gazette, was just over a month in duration. The Spanish-American War, which Crane covered first for Pulitzer's New York World and then, briefly, for Hearst, lasted just over three months in 1898.

In the literature of journalism, the prevailing image of Crane as a war correspondent is that of a hotshot literary celebrity who flopped in the job of covering the war. Brown's landmark study of the Spanish-American War correspondents offers an alternative view and is a notable exception. He was able to avoid the typical errors found in other works and offer a fair and complete account of Crane's work. The depth and care of his scholarship is obvious.[12] Most often, however, Crane receives superficial or negative treatment, or both, and the overall impression conveyed is usually a negative one. It is an image based on a crazy-quilt of fact, error, and myth, not unlike what has persisted in Crane scholarship generally over the years.

An example of the kind of summary judgment of Crane that is common in the literature predating "Pen and Sword," the 1980 AEJ paper referred to earlier, is found in Mott's American Journalism. After noting that Crane was ill from exhaustion and fever much of the time, Mott states: "Picturesque though his signed articles were, he was far from a satisfactory correspondent." Mott tells of Crane's displays of "courage near to recklessness when under fire" but does not elaborate on that nor on the judgment that Crane was "far from...satisfactory."[13] If that statement is meant to convey the idea that Crane's employers found his work unsatisfactory, then it may be conjectured that Mott's judgment results from knowledge that Crane's association with the World was ended before the end of the war. It is indisputable

that sometime between July 20, 1898, when his last signed article for the World appeared, and August 5, 1898, the dateline of his first dispatch for the Journal, Crane and the World parted company. Whether he was fired or quit is uncertain, as is the reason for the break in the relationship.

This points to the most common fact problem in the treatment of Crane. No matter how favorably they have rated his writing, nearly all of the writers who have dealt with Crane as a war correspondent have persisted in repeating the same unchecked and unsubstantiated story about his departure from the World's corps of correspondents, i.e., that he brought down upon himself the wrath of the newspaper's management because he

> made the mistake of telling the truth about the conduct of New York's Seventy-first [Regiment], and Pulitzer found himself assailed by Hearst for slandering the heroism of New York's sons.[14]

The persistence of this story can be easily traced through the literature from 1924, when Don Carlos Seitz's biography of Pulitzer was published. It is Seitz that most writers, in journalism and in other disciplines, have cited as authority for the story--when they have cited a specific source, which has not been often. Reporting the World management's disappointment with Crane, Seitz states:

> Stephen Crane...sent only one dispatch of any merit and that, accusing the Seventy-first New York regiment of cowardice at Santiago, imperiled the paper.[15]

Seitz, the newspaper's business manager in 1898, elaborated on the circumstances of Crane's departure in a 1931 article in the Bookman.

> On my way downstairs I met John Norris, the Financial Manager, coming out of his office, rubbing his hands gleefully.
>
> "I have just kissed your little friend Stephen Crane good-bye," he said with a full-face grin. "He came here asking for another advance. 'Don't you think you have had enough of Mr. Pulitzer's money without earning it?' I asked. 'Oh very well,' he said, 'if that is the way you look at it, by-by.' So we're rid of him."
>
> This was the last of Stephen Crane as our War Correspondent.[16]

Seitz does not indicate Crane was fired for writing the dispatch about the Seventy-first New York. Indeed, the recounting of the conversation suggests Crane quit when his request for an advance of funds was rebuked.

Among the works repeating the part of the story told in Seitz that attributes to Crane authorship of the troublesome dispatch are those of Carlson and Bates, Snyder and Morris, Churchill, Swanberg, Tebbel and Hohenberg.[17] Only Hohenberg cites Seitz's biography of Pulitzer. Swanberg cites the New York Journal of July 17, 1898, as the source for the general story about the controversy that arose after the dispatch was published but does not cite a specific source for the information that Crane wrote the dispatch. Others do not cite sources, though if they include bibliographies, Seitz's biography is usually listed. As late as 1974, a work on the Spanish-American War carried the same story.[18]

It is to Mander's credit that she avoided this error in "Pen and Sword" by using the earliest piece of evidence on the question of who wrote the dispatch, Richard Harding Davis's May 1899 Harper's article profiling the war correspondents. To Davis, identification of the author of the dispatch seems to have been no great revelation, as it is present in his article almost as an aside. In a section in the latter part of the article telling of the hardships of illness, bad living conditions, and shabby treatment by their newspapers that the correspondents suffered, this story is related:

> One of the best known of the correspondents, who was on the firing-line at Guantanamo, Guasimas, and San Juan, was sent home, desperately ill with fever, in the same clothes he had been forced to wear for three weeks. He had forded streams in them, slept on the bare ground in them, and sweated in them from the heat and from fever, and when he reached Fortress Monroe he bought himself a complete new outfit at the modest expenditure of twenty-four dollars. For this his paper refused to pay. This was the same paper that discharged Sylvester Scovel for telling the truth about the Seventy-first New York Volunteers and for returning a blow.[19]

The unnamed correspondent is Crane; the newspaper is the World.[20] It was reimbursement for the cost of the new clothes that Crane was seeking when he went to the newspaper's offices and received the rebuke from the financial manager.[21]

The lack of acknowledgement of this information that is apparent in journalism historiography is striking, even appalling. Equally so is the misuse of Davis's words. Both Snyder and Morris and Hohenberg use Davis's phrase "telling the truth about the Seventy-first" but state it was Crane who did it.[22] Hohenberg cites the Davis article as one of the sources for his passage dealing with Crane's firing by the World.[23] In the works of Snyder and Morris and in those of Tebbel, the phrase "made the mistake of" telling the truth is used.[24]

Crane scholars, starting with Williams in 1948, have handled the matter more carefully by combining the evidence in Davis's article with other evidence. Noting that "the dispatch seems hardly worth the furore," Williams cites Davis, Edward Marshall, who was a correspondent for the Journal, and Edwin Emerson Jr., a correspondent for Collier's, as sources for the identification of Scovel as author of the dispatch, though he states Scovel was not fired for writing it.[25] Brown attempted to set the record straight in journalism historiography in 1967 (though later writers apparently missed it) by drawing upon Williams's other reasons for concluding Crane did not write the dispatch.[26] Crane left Siboney, Cuba, July 8 and arrived at Fort Monroe, Old Point Comfort, Virginia, on July 13 on a transport ship carrying sick and wounded soldiers; the dispatch is datelined "Port Antonio, July 15."[27] The dispatch has none of Crane's distinctive style and, states Brown, "is so unlike anything he ever wrote it surely cannot be by his hand."[28] The dispatch is unsigned, unlike Crane's other dispatches.[29] Brown gives these as his reasons for concluding it is "most improbable" Crane wrote the dispatch. Williams describes them as providing "incontrovertible proof of [Crane's] innocence in the matter."[30]

Brown also refutes Seitz's charge that Crane "sent only one dispatch of any merit." To the contrary, Crane gave the World "some 60,000 words, a respectable output for any reporter, and [his dispatches] are generally recognized as outstanding war reporting."[31] The efforts of the editors of the University of Virginia Edition of the Works of Stephen Crane have resulted in the identification of 23 Crane dispatches for the World.[32]

Evidence bearing on Seitz's reliability as a source is found in his 1931 article.[33] The World published ten of Crane's dispatches from April 28 through June 26. Eight were signed, one was signed and bylined, and one was bylined. Two of them had his name in the headline or a subhead. Yet Seitz states that the "first word we got from Stephen Crane was on July 1." Further, his description of this July 1 dispatch shows Seitz apparently confused elements of a June 13 dispatch reportedly written for Crane by Ernest McCready of the New York Herald from information gathered by Crane, which appeared unsigned, with elements of Crane's July 1 dispatch, which was published under the headline "The Red Badge of Courage Was His Wig-Wag Flag."[34] Seitz then states that Crane, covering the Army, was not heard from after July 4 for two weeks before the dispatch on the Seventy-first New York came in. In fact, the newspaper published six of his dispatches, all signed, between July 7 and July 14, and Crane transmitted three others between July 4 and July 7 that were published after the disputed dispatch. Further, Seitz's comments again show him confusing dispatches in his noting of certain elements in Crane's final dispatch (published July 20) that are actually in the July 1 dispatch.[35] On the basis of such questionable testimony as that of Seitz, Crane's reputation as a war correspondent has never been secure. As Stallman notes, "Journalist Crane has been impugned for four [now five] decades because historians...lifted from Seitz, without checking the facts."[36]

The question of whether Crane was fired or whether he quit after his reception in the newspaper's offices is still unresolved. Stallman suggests that Seitz probably accused Crane of writing the dispatch about the Seventy-first New York and that "Crane very likely shrugged his shoulders at the accusation so as to shield his friend Scovel from blame."[37] Weinstein, noting that Crane "left the employ of the World for unknown reasons," states:

> This seemed the only instance during the period of his literary fame when his newspaper employers made known any dissatisfaction with his reporting.[38]

The sources of that dissatisfaction have been variously suggested. Everything from Crane's generally unconventional methods of reporting and style of writing to the personal dislike some regular newspapermen, such as Seitz, had for Crane, from his criticism of the glorification of volunteers and the Army's use of black powder when the Spanish had smokeless powder to his sending of wounded Journal correspondent Edward Marshall's dispatch have been offered among the many possibilities said to explain the dissatisfaction.[39]

* * * * * * * * * * *

Whatever the reasons for the dissatisfaction, it is unlikely that it had anything to do with Crane's being, as is suggested in Mander's "Pen and Sword," "lazy and too devoted to the bottle to get any real reporting done." He may have given Scovel occasional problems with regard to meeting deadlines and getting his copy in, but he was not the failure Mander asserts he was.

He was, in fact, the "good correspondent" that Mander, using Richard Harding Davis's criteria, defines. Davis said so himself, applying those criteria to Crane. Mander quotes Davis as saying "that a good correspondent was a 'man who by his energy and resource [saw] more of the war, both afloat and ashore, than...his rivals, and who [was] able to make the public see what he saw.'"[40] But this excerpt

from Davis stops too soon. A more complete quotation from Davis is required here:

> The best correspondent is probably the man who by his energy and resource sees more of the war, both afloat and ashore, than do his rivals, and who is able to make the public see that he saw. If that is a good definition, Stephen Crane would seem to have distinctly won first place among correspondents in the late disturbance.
> ...
> Near the close of the war, a group of correspondents in Puerto Rico made out a list of the events which, in their opinion, were of the greatest news value during the campaign, and a list of the correspondents, with the events each had witnessed credited to his name. Mr. Crane easily led all the rest. Of his power to make the public see what he sees it would be impertinent to speak.
> ...
> His story of the Marine at Guantanamo...illustrates that in his devotion to duty, and also in his readiness at the exciting moments of life, Crane is quite as much of a soldier as the man whose courage he described.
> Crane was the coolest man, whether army officer or civilian, that I saw under fire at any time during the war. He was most annoyingly cool, with the assurance of a fatalist.[42]

Based on what Davis had to say about Crane's performance, one can easily agree with Kneibert that it has been generally underestimated.[43]

Additional support for Crane's reputation is found in another source Mander cites in making the case that Crane, as a "literary star," fulfilled editors' expectations that the "famous writers [would have no] sense whatever for news."[44] Journal editor Arthur Brisbane's 1898 Cosmopolitan article is used but only in part. After the passage revealing the editor's feeling that there was "little hope of results from the fine names" (such as Crane), comes this paragraph:

> But lo and behold! All the celebrities turned out to be natural-born reporters, as eager as any to get near the fighting and as quick to get their work ready. That was a blessed revelation for the sad editor whose time and money had been often devoted to buying what was not delivered--the fruit of genius.[45]

Brisbane states that famous writers such as Crane were needed by the newspapers because "not mere news alone will do to-day. First, What happened? second, how did it impress this or the other man with a name?"[46] Later, contrasting the work of the Journal's James Creelman with Crane's work, Brisbane observes:

> Mr. Creelman is a newspaper writer whose business and delight consist in telling about the big things that really happen in the world. The bigger the better, of course. He cares less for the form of the telling than for the fact to be told.
>
> Mr. Crane's interest in life is not so much to tell what happens as to make telling it interesting. Mr. Creelman went to the war for facts; Mr. Crane went for a chance to write good descriptions, and to see with his own eyes what had been seen by his imagination. Creelman got the facts and also got shot. Crane wrote very good articles, lived through a Red Badge of Courage experience in real life and got the fever. He has not been shot as yet.[47]

In contrast, Myers, in his 1964 master's thesis, concludes that Crane failed as a correspondent because "he liked to write, but not to report news, and...preferred drinking to working"; "seemed to think it was his business to gather impressions and write them as the spirit moved"; and "wrote when his artistic temperament and judgment dictated and not by deadlines." In concluding "Crane was a poor reporter," Myers states that Crane's "stories dealt mostly with the sidelights of the campaigns, not its important events."[48] Little solid evidence is offered in support of Myers' overall negative evaluation of Crane's performance.

In fairness to some of the other works in journalism cited earlier for shaky scholarship in dealing with the story of the dispatch about the Seventy-first New York, it must be noted that they generally do give credit to Crane for outstanding reporting and writing. Tebbel, for example, states that Crane filed some of the "best stories" of the war.

> They were not tales of battle, for the most part, but of soldiers and soldiering--the kind of reporting Ernie Pyle was to do in the Second World War. He could cover the hard news just as capably, however, and proved it in his stories from Guantanamo Bay in June 1898, when the first American casualties were recorded....He was cited later for his bravery under fire.[49]

In addition to Davis and Brisbane, other contemporaries made similarly commendatory comments, some of them immediately after Crane's death. A writer for the London Daily Chronicle reported that

> "Little Stevey"--as his friends and colleagues delighted to call him--was possessed of the highest and truest courage, the courage of a man of keen imagination, and he proved it on more than one stricken field.[50]

A Marine officer wrote him in December 1899:

> I, in company with all my brother officers, have always looked back with pleasure and pride upon your service with us in Cuba, for you were the only outsider who saw it all, and we regard you as an honorary member of the Corps and hope you will always have the same affection for us as we have for you.[51]

Even the New York World publicly offered its praise, though not until after Crane's death. In an obituary tribute headlined "Madcap Genius Stephen Crane," it told its readers:

> An engaging genius was Stephen Crane, intensely human in all his impulses, lovable in his very frailties. Men lament his untimely taking off because he was such a fine, brave, madcap, generous comrade; women because he had the winning gift of eye and speech whose secret cannot be told in words....[His war dispatches] were masterpieces of description. If he had a fault as a war correspondent it was that his enthusiasm took him too deeply into the thick of the fighting.[52]

* * * * * * * * * *

> "But to get the real thing!" cried Vernall, the war correspondent. "It seems impossible!..."
>
> --War Memories[53]

To get an accurate account of Stephen Crane's service as a correspondent in the Spanish-American War seems impossible--if one relies on most of the relevant works in journalism historiography. Writing "without fear or much research," to use Arthur S. Link's comment about historians in another context, many journalism scholars have largely failed at the task of dealing with Crane in a manner that is in accord with available evidence.[54] As has occurred in Crane scholarship in general over the years, there have been "failures, often incredible, in scholarly responsibility."[55] As has been noted about historical scholarship in general, it appears that the "fundamental skill of factual verification has not been sufficiently attended to" in journalism historiography.[56]

There may be more to the problem than failure to verify facts or misuse of evidence. For example, it might be argued that, except for Brown, many of the writers and works cited above have been concerned with broader issues and bigger pictures, with the more important personalities in American journalism. Because Crane is a secondary figure, there is no reason to exert oneself in researching his work. However, this seems clearly to be a shunning of scholarly responsibility. Even the least important fact, when stated as fact, should be verified, even in studies that are broad in scope. And that verification should extend to an assessment of the reliability of the sources consulted and the seeking of corroborating evidence.

Part of the problem related to assessment of reliability seems to derive from an orientation in journalism historiography toward the "regulars" in journalism and toward mainstream journalism. Because of this orientation, journalism historians seem to be inclined to accept as authoritative and accurate the testimony of mainstream publishers, editors, and reporters over other evidence that might come from outside the mainstream. They seem to more highly esteem and give more favorable treatment to the work of the regular news reporter than that of the special corres-

pondent, the free-lancer, the literary journalist.[57] Journalism historians seem often to be wearing blinders that do not permit them to see the contributions of any but a small, select group of journalists.

The possible solutions to the problem seem, in part, simple ones: doing more rigorous research, verifying information, seeking other evidence and using it responsibly, and becoming aware of relevant scholarship in other fields. Beyond these steps, however, lies more difficult terrain requiring changes in attitude, a greater willingness to question assumptions and stereotypes, and the adoption of a stance in which the scholar, like the good reporter, is able to set aside predispositions when appropriate.[58] To take these steps would seem to be the way to eliminate the "Crane Problem" and any similar problems in journalism historiography.

NOTES

[1]Crane to Nellie Crouse, December 31, 1895, in Stephen Crane: Letters, ed. R. W. Stallman and Lillian Gilkes (New York: New York University Press, 1960), p. 86 (hereafter cited as Letters).

[2]Crane to Ripley Hitchcock, March 15?, 1896, in Letters, p. 119.

[3]Thomas Beer notes that Crane "took no trouble to annotate himself for history." Beer, Stephen Crane: A Study in American Letters (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1923; reprint ed., New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1972), p. 247.

[4]Willis Fletcher Johnson, "The Launching of Stephen Crane," Literary Digest International Book Review 4 (April 1926): 288.

[5]Edwin H. Cady, Stephen Crane, rev. ed. (New York: Twayne, 1980), p. 15. See Max Westbrook, "Whilomville: The Coherence of Radical Language," in Stephen Crane in Transition: Centenary Essays, ed. Joseph Katz (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1972), pp. 86-105, and Warner Berthoff, The Ferment of Realism: American Literature, 1884-1919 (New York: Macmillan, 1965), pp. 230-33, on the "Crane Problem." Useful sources for gaining a view of the biographical and critical literature on Crane (and an awareness of the wide range of readings of his works) are R. W. Stallman, Stephen Crane: A Critical Bibliography (Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1972); and Donald Pizer, "Stephen Crane: A Review of Scholarship and Criticism Since 1969," Studies in the Novel 10 (Spring 1978): 120-45.

[6]Oliver Knight, review of The War Dispatches of Stephen Crane, ed. by R. W. Stallman and E. R. Hagemann, in Journalism Quarterly 42 (Spring 1965): 303.

[7]Edwin Emery and Michael Emery, The Press and America, 4th ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1978), p. 247; Edwin Emery, The Press and America, 3rd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972), pp. 358,374 (Crane gets less mention in later edition); Michael Schudson, Discovering the News (New York: Basic Books, 1978), p. 73. See also Donald A. Sears and Margaret Bourland, "Journalism Makes the Style," Journalism Quarterly 47 (Autumn 1970): 504-9, showing differences in style between writers, including Crane, who had journalism experience and those who did not. For a literary scholar's view see Joseph Kwait, "The Newspaper Experience: Crane, Norris, and Dreiser," Nineteenth Century Fiction 8 (September 1953): 99-117.

[8]Mary S. Mander, "Pen and Sword: Reporting the Spanish-American War," paper presented to the History Division at the annual convention of the Association for Education in Journalism, Boston, August 13, 1980, p. 5. The source cited for this dismissal of Crane is Cecil Carnes, Jimmy Hare: News Photographer (New York: Macmillan, 1940), p. 60, whose words are paraphrased and embellished. Carnes has it that Hare described Crane as "a charming fellow, fond of a drink, and not too fond of work." Also, "Scovel, in charge of the World correspondents in the field, usually found it difficult to get Crane's copy." Later in the book, Hare is described accompanying Crane around the San Juan battlefield where Crane does some "real reporting." Carnes, pp. 70-75.

[9]A full-scale study of Crane's journalistic writing in general and of his Spanish-American War dispatches in particular is beyond the scope of the present paper. More work in analysing Crane's journalism from a journalistic, rather than a literary, point of view is needed, as Knight notes, p. 303.

[10]"Of all human lots for a person of sensibility that of an obscure free lance in literature or journalism is, I think, the most discouraging." Crane to editor of Leslie's Weekly, (November 1895)?, in Letters, p. 78.

On Crane's journalism general, the following are most useful: Crane, Tales, Sketches, and Reports. Vol. VIII. University of Virginia Edition of the Works of Stephen Crane, ed. Fredson Bowers (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1970) (hereafter cited as Works, Vol. VIII); R. W. Stallman and E. R. Hagemann, eds., The New York City Sketches of Stephen Crane and Related Pieces (New York: New York University Press, 1966); Laura L. Nagy, "Apprenticeship of an Artist: The Early Journalism of Stephen Crane" (master's thesis, Kent State University, 1976); Bernard Weinstein, "Stephen Crane: Journalist," in Stephen Crane in Transition, pp. 3-34; Milne Holton, Cylinder of Vision: The Fiction and Journalistic Writing of Stephen Crane (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1972); and Olov W. Fryckstedt, ed., Stephen Crane: Uncollected Writings (Uppsala, Sweden: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1963).

On specific segments of his career see Joseph Katz, ed., Stephen Crane in the West and Mexico (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1970), on Crane as a special correspondent for the Bacheller Syndicate; Victor A. Elconin, "Stephen Crane at Asbury Park," American Literature 20 (November 1948): 278-89, and Johnson, "The Launching of Stephen Crane," on Crane's early work for his brother Townley's news agency at the New Jersey shore; Joseph Katz, "Stephen Crane: Muckraker," Columbia Library Columns 17 (February 1968): 3-7, into a coal mine for McClure's in 1894; and Bernice Slote, "Stephen Crane in Nebraska," Prairie Schooner 43 (Summer 1969): 192-99, on the Bacheller trip.

In addition, the following biographies are useful: Beer, Stephen Crane: A Study in American Letters; John Berryman, Stephen Crane (New York: William Sloane, 1950); and R. W. Stallman, Stephen Crane: A Biography (New York: George Braziller, 1968).

[11]On his war correspondence, see: Crane, Reports of War. Vol. IX. University of Virginia Edition of the Works of Stephen Crane, ed. Fredson Bowers (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1971) (hereafter cited as Works, Vol. IX); Stallman and Hagemann, The War Dispatches of Stephen Crane (New York: New York University Press, 1964); Amos W. Williams, "Stephen Crane: War Correspondent," New Colophon 1 (April 1948): 113-23; Frederick D. Kneibert, "An Investigation of the Career of Stephen Crane as a War Correspondent" (master's thesis, University of Missouri, 1965); and Otto Carmichael, "Stephen Crane in Havana," Prairie Schooner 43 (Summer 1969): 200-4, on Crane's work for Hearst in post-war Havana. How Crane turned his war experiences into literary works is shown in Crane, Tales of War. Vol. VI. University of Virginia Edition of the Works of Stephen Crane, ed. Fredson Bowers (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1970) (hereafter cited as Works, Vol. VI). Also of interest is Active Service, Crane's 1899 novel about a war correspondent in Greece. According to Beer, Crane, while trying to complete the novel, noted on a post card that "a reporter is no hero for a novel." Beer, pp. 183-84.

[12]Charles H. Brown, The Correspondents' War: Journalists in the Spanish-American War (New York: Scribner's, 1967).

[13]Frank Luther Mott, American Journalism: A History, 1690-1960, 3rd ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1962), p. 534.

[14]Louis L. Snyder and Richard B. Morris, eds., A Treasury of Great Reporting, rev. ed. (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1962), p. 240.

[15]Don Carlos Seitz, Joseph Pulitzer: His Life and Letters (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1924), p. 241. The dispatch in question ran under the headline "Conduct of the 71st New York at Charge of San Juan," New York World, July 16, 1898, p. 1.

[16]Don Carlos Seitz, "Stephen Crane: War Correspondent," Bookman 76 (February 1933): 139-40. This apparently occurred on July 20, 1898, because Seitz states that it was on the day Crane's final dispatch for the World was published. See Works, Vol. IX, p. 495.

[17]Oliver Carlson and Ernest Bates, Hearst: Lord of San Simeon (New York: Viking, 1936; reprint ed., Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1970), p. 107; Snyder and Morris, p. 240; Allen Churchill, Park Row (New York: Rinehart, 1958; reprint ed., Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1972), pp. 130-31; W. A. Swanberg, Citizen Hearst (New York: Scribner's, 1961), pp. 159-60, and Pulitzer (New York: Scribner's, 1967), p. 252; John Tebbel, The Compact History of the American Newspaper (New York: Hawthorn, 1963), p. 203, and The Media in America (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1974), p. 273; and John Hohenberg, Foreign Correspondence: The Great Reporters and Their Times (New York: Columbia University Press, 1964), p. 137.

[18]Gerald Linderman, The Mirror of War (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1974), pp. 170-71.

[19]Richard Harding Davis, "Our War Correspondents in Cuba and Puerto Rico," Harper's 98 (May 1899): 947 (emphasis added). For a valuable analysis of the Davis-Crane relationship, see Scott C. Osborn, "The 'Rivalry-Chivalry' of Richard Harding Davis and Stephen Crane," American Literature 28 (March 1956): 50-61. Mander seems to question, without explicitly saying so, Davis's statement that Scovel was fired for both writing the dispatch and for striking General William R. Shafter ("returning a blow"). Mander, "Pen and Sword," n. 63, p. 27. The story of Scovel's fracas with General Shafter is told in Brown, pp. 402-9. It is a matter of dispute as to whether Scovel struck Shafter or missed.

[20]The evidence that it is Crane and the World Davis is describing is found in several of Crane's dispatches, in Works, Vol. IX, pp. 103-73; and in "War Memories," Works, Vol VI, pp. 259-61. In regard to Crane's physical exertion and illnesses, Larzer Ziff comments: "Thanks to such mothering as Davis's, the war did not kill Crane." Ziff, The American 1890s (New York: Viking, 1966), p. 220.

[21]See Berryman, p. 226; and Stallman, Stephen Crane: A Biography, pp. 406-7.

[22]Snyder and Morris, p. 240; Hohenberg, p. 137. Both use figures for "Seventy-first," unlike Davis.

[23]Hohenberg, p. 137. Also cited are Seitz, Joseph Pulitzer; Swanberg, Citizen Hearst; and Margaret Leech, In the Days of McKinley (New York: Harper and Row, 1959).

[24]Snyder and Morris, p. 240. In Tebbel's two works the phrase is "made the mistake of describing two accurately the behavior of New York's Seventy-first Regiment." The Compact History of the American Newspaper, p. 203, and The Media in America, p. 273. See also Walter Millis, The Martial Spirit: A Study of Our War With Spain (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1931), p. 348, citing Seitz's Joseph Pulitzer. Millis writes that Crane's dispatch "incautiously told the truth about the conduct of the Seventy-first New York at San Juan." Millis's work is almost invariably listed, along with Seitz's Joseph Pulitzer, in the bibliographies of writers who have told the story. Gregory Mason's Remember the Maine (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1939), p. 186, also carries the story.

[25]Williams, pp. 117-20. Berryman states that Seitz's "attribution to Crane of a World dispatch critical of the New York Seventy-first has now been disposed of by Ames W. Williams...; Scovel wrote it." Berryman, p. 226. See also Stallman, Stephen Crane: A Biography, pp. 406-7 and n. 1, p. 608.

A further complication here is that Crane's champions in this matter, starting with Williams, have erroneously identified Edward Marshall's The Story of the Rough Riders (New York: G. W. Dillingham, 1899) as one of the sources that reveals Scovel wrote the dispatch. See Williams, p. 118; Berryman, p. 226; Stallman and Hagemann, The War Dispatches of Stephen Crane, p. 110; and Stallman, Stephen Crane: A Biography, p. 406 and n. 1, p. 608. A careful reading and re-reading of Marshall's book turned up no such information. The problem seems to have occurred because Williams erred in his essay by identifying an excerpt from Davis's article as having come from Marshall's book. Later writers repeated the error.

[26]Williams, p. 118; Brown, p. 432

[27]Williams, p. 118; Brown, p. 432. In addition, Works, Vol. IX, p. 492, notes that Crane's long piece on the Battle of San Juan was "probably sent by telegraph from Old Point Comfort July 14." Port Antonio, Jamaica, was a cable station used by the correspondents.

[28]Williams, p. 118; Brown, p. 432.

[29]Williams, p. 118; Brown, p. 432. Brown doubts either Crane or Scovel wrote the dispatch since both were "reportorial stars" and "invariably received" bylines. He may mean their dispatches were invariably signed. A check of Crane's dispatches in Works, Vol. IX shows he received only three bylines in the World, though all but one of his dispatches were signed and, in five cases, his name was prominent in the headline or a subhead. It may be conjectured that Scovel did write the dispatch since it refers to "The World correspondent," and Scovel was the newspaper's chief of staff in Cuba. Crane was usually identified as either "a staff correspondent" or "a special correspondent."

[30]Brown, p. 432; Williams, p. 118. Thomas I. Myers examines the matter and concludes Williams's arguments are "inconclusive." He does not give his grounds for so concluding, however. Myers, "American Correspondents in Cuba During the Spanish-American War" (master's thesis, Pennsylvania State University, 1964), pp. 83-5.

[31]Brown, p. 432.

[32]Fredson Bower, "Foreword," Works, Vol. IX, pp. vii-viii, reports that 38 newspapers were searched for the period 1897-1900 (since Crane's dispatches were sold to other newspapers around the country), and three previously unknown pieces were discovered, along with several thousand words of added text. In addition to his dispatches for the World, the volume has 20 done for the Journal, three from Puerto Rico and 17 from Havana. The analysis of the dates and content of the dispatches in the text is drawn from this volume.

[33]The analysis that follows is similar to Williams's but was developed independently of his, before his article was obtained and read. See Williams's, p. 117.

[34]Seitz, "Stephen Crane: War Correspondent," p. 138. On McCready and Crane, see Ralph Paine, Roads of Adventure (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1922), pp. 243-247; and Stallman, Stephen Crane: A Biography, p. 365-67, who draws from Paine and quotes from a letter from McCready to B. J. R. Stolper, January 22, 1934, in the Columbia University Crane Collection.

[35]Seitz, "Stephen Crane: War Correspondent," p. 139. "Obviously Seitz is confused," observes Williams, p. 119.

[36]Stallman, Stephen Crane: A Biography, n. 1, p. 608.

[37]Stallman, Stephen Crane: A Biography, p. 406. Williams, p. 119. errs in saying that Seitz says Crane was fired. Brown, p. 432, states it is uncertain whether Crane was fired or whether he quit. Myers states that "Pulitzer expressed dissatisfaction with Crane's work and fired him, according to Richard Harding Davis." However, he does not cite a source for this. Myers, p. 14.

[38]Weinstein, "Stephen Crane: Journalist," p. 10.

[39]See "Stephen Crane at the Front for The World," New York World, July 7, 1898, p. 6, in Works, Vol. IX, p. 145. On the World's grudge against Crane for filing the dispatch for Marshall, who had published Crane work in the New York Press four years earlier and who was an old, close friend, see Stallman and Hagemann, The War Dispatches of Stephen Crane, pp. 109-10. Marshall tells of Crane's aiding him after Marshall's wounding at Guasimas in The Story of the Rough Riders, pp. 140-143. Berryman states that Scovel forgave Crane even though the newspaper management never did. No source is cited. Berryman, p. 223. See also Thomas A. Gullason, "Stephen Crane's Private War on Yellow Journalism," Huntington Library Quarterly 22 (May 1959): 201-8, on Crane's problems with newspaper editors and publishers. The various elements mentioned in regard to management's dissatisfaction with Crane are touched on in numerous sources. See notes 10 and 11, above.

[40]Mander, p. 6. The bracketed words are Mander's.

[41]The article cited is "Marines Signalling Under Fire at Guantanamo Bay," McClure's Magazine 12 (February 1899): 332-36. This is a post-war reworking of the basic material in "The Red Badge of Courage Was His Wig-Wag Flag," New York World, July 1, 1898, p. 3, in Works, Vol. IX, pp. 134-42, and other dispatches concerning the Marines at Guantanamo. See also "War Memories," in Works, Vol. VI, p. 231: "...it was simply a picture of men at work, men terribly hard at work, red-faced, sweating, gasping toilers."

[42]Davis, pp. 941-42 (emphasis added). "Davis, his golden luck ever with him, was the best correspondent in the war, but Davis himself claimed Crane was because he knew that Crane was the best writer there." Ziff, p. 202.

[43]Kneibert, in Journalism Abstracts 3 (1965): 96. However, Myers, who asserts that "Davis seems to have made excuses for his friend's laziness," declares, "The one conclusion that can be drawn is that Crane was a poor reporter." He refers in three places to a "consensus" that Crane failed to do his job, but Myers fails to support his assertions. "The consensus was that he liked to write, but not to report news, and that he preferred drinking to working." Myers, pp. 14, 51, 83-84. Churchill states that "Crane did not seem to be of the rugged stuff from which front-line correspondents are made." Churchill, p. 129.

[44]Mander, p. 5

[45]Arthur Brisbane, "The Modern Newspaper in War Time," Cosmopolitan 25 (September 1898): 550.

[46]Brisbane, p. 549

[47]Brisbane, pp. 556-57. See also Davis, pp. 943-44, for his categorizing of the various correspondents.

[48]Myers, pp. 14, 50, 85.

[49]Tebbel, The Media in America, p. 273. A similarity between Crane's work in Cuba and Greece and that of Ernie Pyle in World War II has frequently been noted. In Active Service (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1926; reprint ed., New York: Russell and Russell, 1963), pp. 98-99, Crane observes: "...a man doing his best in the middle of a sea of war longs to have people see him doing his best....The war correspondent arises, then, to become a sort of cheap telescope for the people at home; further still, there have been fights where the eyes of a solitary man were the eyes of the world--one spectator whose business it was to transfer, according to his ability, his visual impressions to other minds."

On his being cited for bravery, Williams reports that Marine Captain G. F. Elliott, commander of the Marine detachment at Guantanamo, commended Crane to the Secretary of the Navy. Williams, p. 117, citing Supplementary Report of June 18, 1898, Records of the United States Marine Corps. See also Stallman, Stephen Crane: A Biography, pp. 364-69.

[50]London Daily Chronicle, June 6, 1900, quoted in Stallman, Stephen Crane: A Biography, p. 371.

[51]Major Charles McCawley to Crane, December 30, 1899, in Columbia University Crane Collection, quoted in Stallman, Stephen Crane: A Biography, n. 1, p. 606.

[52]New York World, June 10, 1900, p. E-3.

[53]Crane, "War Memories," in Works, Vol. VI, p. 222.

[54]Arthur S. Link, "What Happened to the Progressive Movement in the 1920s?" American Historical Review 44 (July 1959): 833.

[55]Cady, p. 17, on one of the reasons Crane remains an elusive figure.

[56]David Hackett Fischer, Historians' Fallacies: Toward a Logic of Historical Thought (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), p. 40.

[57]A recent exception is Sarah R. Shaber, "Hemingway's Literary Journalism: The Spanish Civil War Dispatches," Journalism Quarterly 57 (Autumn 1980): 420-24, 535.

[58]See Mary S. Mander, "Intuition of Cultural Historian, Reconstruction of Historical Truth, Purpose and Reason in Lost Worlds, Face Critical Intellectual Rigor," Newsletter, Qualitative Studies Division, AEJ, 7 (Spring 1981): 2-3.